

BIOFUELS ENERGY
INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week, while our troops are in the field in the Middle East and Central Asia, President of the United States George Bush issued an executive order to expand the United States' Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and I emphasize the words "petroleum reserve," to maximize, as the President said, long-term protection against oil supply disruptions. And again I emphasize the word "oil."

With all due respect to the President, at this time in our country's history, I think he is moving in exactly the wrong direction. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve's name should be changed to the Strategic Fuels Reserve. And in lieu of what is happening, we should begin to move our country in a new, nonpetroleum direction. We have to go beyond the petroleum age.

Under the President's executive order, our Energy Secretary, Spencer Abraham, was ordered to increase the current reserve from its level of 545 million barrels, because it is not filled up, to 700 million barrels, calling the reserve an important element of our Nation's energy security. Indeed, having a strategic fuels reserve is in the Nation's security interests. However, the President needs to think about moving America toward energy independence, not keeping us wedded to the petroleum age.

And let me just reference this chart. If we look back to the 1980s, the amount of petroleum that is used annually has slowly been rising. The share of petroleum that comes from foreign nations has been rising until this year, and last year we will be over half. One-fifth of it comes from the oil-producing nations of the Middle East, one-fifth; and the rest from places like Nigeria, not exactly known for its love of democracy, and other points on the globe.

I think that the President is half-right. The President is right to try to assure energy security here at home, but the way he is doing it is wrong.

Now, some Americans have gotten the right message. In fact, this week in Maryland, and I would like to enter into the RECORD a story from the Washington Post, a mom-and-pop Chevron station in Laurel, Maryland, became the first station in that State, and only the second one in the mid-Atlantic region of our country, to offer E85, a mixture of gasoline and alcohol fuel distilled from corn or other grains. They understand we have to move America beyond the petroleum age, using ethanol as one of the most important new fuels of the future.

In this article they talk about aiming to reduce petroleum consumption

and greenhouse gas emissions by boosting the use of ethanol fuels; and they are selling the gasoline up there in Maryland for \$1.33 a gallon and they figure, if nothing else, it will bring more consumers to the part of the business that turns a profit.

Arianna Huffington wrote a story in the L.A. Times today. She also got the right message. She has a can-do spirit for America. She basically says, "We can all make simple adjustments to wean our country from our dependence on foreign oil." She says, "In practice, what are we really being asked to do in this war as individual Americans? We are being asked to shop till we drop, we are being asked to eat out, and to visit Disneyland.

"Given our ability to play hardball with nations that harbor terrorists is going to be seriously compromised by our foreign oil habit, shouldn't we be doing everything we can to reduce that dependence starting, say," she says, maybe yesterday? "America cannot go on consuming 25 percent of the world's oil while being only 5 percent of the global population."

Then, in the New York Times this week, Thomas Friedman says the predicament the free world faces is due to oil money and the fact that we are so wedded to those systems; and, in fact, oil being the major reason for those economies of the Middle East even being able to survive.

The New York Times a month ago had an editorial and I quote, entitled "Reconsidering Saudi Arabia. Washington's embrace of the Saudi royal family dates back to the era of Franklin Roosevelt. It has always been primarily about oil."

And then Seymour Hersh, in the October 22 issue of The New Yorker, says the following: "The United States is hostage to the stability of the Saudi system," a prominent Middle Eastern oil man reported to me. "The war was declared by bin Laden, but there are thousands of bin Ladens. The fabulous military machine America has is completely useless to the enemy you face."

The article goes on, "The Saudi regime," he says, "will explode in time. If they do a similar operation in Saudi Arabia has they did in New York, the price of oil will go up to \$100 a barrel, more than four times what we pay today."

I commend to my colleagues our bill, H.R. 3099, which asks that the President exchange 2,100,000 barrels from the current petroleum reserve and convert it to the purchase of ethanol and biofuels in order to move America toward energy independence. It is time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the article entitled "Hoping to Fuel Demand With Supply," which I referred to earlier:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 2001]

HOPING TO FUEL DEMAND WITH SUPPLY

(By Anita Huslin)

For nearly a decade, state and federal governments have been buying fleets of vehicles capable of running on a cleaner-burning mixture of gasoline and ethanol.

Few of the vehicles, however, have ever had a drop in their tanks because the blend is available at just 101 fuel stations nationwide—most of them in the Midwest.

Yesterday, a mom-and-pop Chevron in Laurel became the first fuel station in Maryland and only the second in the mid-Atlantic region to offer E85, a mixture of gasoline and an alcohol fuel distilled from corn and other grains. The blend has been touted as an alternative to foreign oil and as being gentler on the environment, though the environmental claim has been debated.

Maryland Energy Administration officials hope to open E85 pumps in Annapolis, Gaithersburg and Baltimore in the next year.

At a pump festooned with red, white and blue flags, beaming auto manufacturing representatives and farmers applauded as the first state vehicle—a standard-issue white Ford Taurus—was filled with the blend of 85 percent ethanol, 15 percent gasoline.

"If you want people to use the fuel, you've got to provide the stations where they can buy it," said Richard F. Pecora, deputy secretary of the Maryland General Services Administration.

Aiming to reduce petroleum consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by boosting the use of alternative fuels, the federal Energy Policy Act of 1992 required that vehicles capable of running on alternative fuels make up 75 percent of state government fleets.

Under a U.S. program to encourage development of such vehicles, auto manufacturers have received credits for producing ethanol-burning cars, trucks and sport-utility vehicles. Those credits allow the companies to build more vehicles that get lower average gas mileage. But because ethanol fuel is sold in just 20 states and, consequently, many alternative fuel vehicles are burning regular gasoline, the program has actually increased pollution, a U.S. Department of Transportation draft study concluded this year.

"Given the slow rate of growth in the alternative fuel infrastructure, it does not appear likely that any energy conservation and environmental benefits will be realized through . . . 2008 unless strong financial incentives are put in place," the report said.

After talking for more than a year with oil companies, none of which expressed any great interest in opening an E85 pump in Maryland, officials came upon Kevin Falls' Chevron Service Center.

It's a modest two-bay repair and fuel station just up the road from Fort Meade and the National Security Administration, two federal installations with growing fleets of alternative fuel vehicles. Officials lined up a U.S. Energy Department grant that would cover the cost of installing the pump, so Falls agreed.

He is selling E85 for the same price as premium gasoline—\$1.33 a gallon—and figures that if nothing else, it will bring more customers to the part of his business that turns a profit.

"The more people you get at the pump, the more jobs we get in the [repair] bays," Falls said. "I figure this'll only help with that."

Jobs are what farmers from the Maryland Grain Producers Association see in Falls's E85 pump. They tout the fuel as a way to boost demand for corn, soybeans, and other grains. "It's going to mean money in our

pockets with an increase in grain prices," said Donnie Tennyson, association president.

The group is looking into building the East Coast's first ethanol production plant in Maryland, in the same way it has been done in the Midwest. There, farmers have raised money to build and operate plants that convert their corn, soybeans and other crops into ethanol, which is then mixed with gasoline and sold at service stations primarily in Illinois, Iowa and Minnesota.

Officials estimate that as many as half a million vehicles in the Washington region can run on an ethanol fuel mix. Only one other station in the region sells E85—the Navy Annex Citgo in Alexandria, near the Pentagon.

With the opening of the E85 pump in Laurel, local auto dealerships said they will begin notifying customers who have bought alternative fuel vehicles. They also said their salespeople will make the fuel option part of their pitch.

"If you have the motivation and the fuel, we have the vehicles," said Michael Paritee, manager of alternative fuels and government sales for General Motors. Several of its vehicles—including the 5.3-liter Suburban, Tahoe, Yukon and Yukon XLS and S-10 pickups—can run on E85.

There is some debate over the environmental benefits of E85. Advocates tout its ability to reduce carbon monoxide emissions, but opponents note that when ethanol is blended with gasoline, the fuel evaporates at a higher rate, producing smog. Environmentalists also say distilling corn starch into ethanol is an energy-intensive process, often involving coal.

Even so, local groups welcomed the opening of the Laurel pump.

"I'd like to think that 10 years from now our farmers will be growing a lot of our energy," said Michael Heller, of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation. "Not just corn and barley, but warm-season grasses that can soak up nutrient pollution, then be harvested and turned into fuel."

U.S. ENGAGED IN A TWO-FRONT WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this country is now engaged in a two-front war. In Afghanistan itself, the war in many places seems to be going well. The President, the Pentagon, our intelligence agencies and other agencies are doing their job well. We also have a second war, and that is the war on the home front. In my view, not nearly enough is being done to provide domestic security at a time when we are under attack from terrorism. We have a large number of vulnerabilities.

Two weeks ago this Congress passed a tax bill which gave \$25 billion in retroactive tax cuts to the largest corporations in this country, repealing all of the taxes those corporations had paid over the past 15 years, retroactively. As a result, one corporation got \$1.4 billion in a tax gift.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the White House's budget arm, seemed to think we had

plenty of room to afford that kind of giveaway. Yet the Office of Management and Budget, the fiscal arm of the White House, is trying to block, along with the leadership of this House, our ability to even get a vote on an effort to add \$7 billion to the security on the home front, that I think we desperately need.

We are trying to add additional agents to the FBI, so they can more rapidly and effectively ferret out terrorists and protect the national interest. We are trying to provide additional resources to our public health departments around the country. We are trying to provide a number of additional areas of support. We are trying to cover more than 1 percent of our food supply that comes into this country, because only 1 percent gets inspected.

We are trying to do a lot to cover those bases, but I want to talk about one area specifically.

This chart represents a day in the life of the U.S. Customs Service. On a typical day, the U.S. Customs Service processes 1.3 million passengers, 2,642 aircraft, 50,889 trucks and containers, 355,000 vehicles, 588 ships, 65,000 entry summaries; and they perform 64 arrests, 223 other seizures, 107 narcotics seizures, and 9 currency seizures. That is part of what these people do for a living every day, all in the service of every American.

We have a serious problem because our Customs Service and our Coast Guard do not have enough people in order to secure the borders of the United States. Right now, there are 64 points of entry on the Canadian border which are not open full time. When they are closed, there are two deterrents to illegal entry: One is a little gate with a stop sign, as pictured in this picture, which says "This port is closed. Warning, \$5,000 fine for entering the United States through a closed port. Nearest open port is 70 miles east at portal on Canadian Highway 39."

This represents our deterrent, along with this: a traffic cone. I do not think it is going to scare many terrorists who want to illegally enter the United States.

□ 1545

Yet we are being prevented from even bringing to the floor a measure to try to do something about that. We not only have problems with roads; we have problems with ports. My own major port of Duluth-Superior, for instance, is a port of access in this country.

Meanwhile, we have many ports closed; we have hour after hour backup of trucks at other points of entry that are open 24 hours a day. This backup means that many of our American industries are not able to produce fully because they cannot get the materials they need. This is just one of the many security problems we are trying to deal

with; and the problem we are facing, I am sorry to say, is that the leadership of this House is preventing us from getting votes on three amendments: one to ensure that our friends in New York get the relief they were promised 2 months ago; the second to make certain that we increase the Pentagon budget in areas thought necessary; and, third, to increase our homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the leadership of this House to allow us to vote on those three amendments. They do not need to vote for them, just allow us to vote on them.

There was an amendment today offered on New York which purports to take care of those problems. With all due respect, in my view, any Member of the New York delegation who tries to walk around in public using that as a fig leaf would be arrested for indecent exposure because that amendment does virtually nothing. It gives no political cover; and it should not, because it provides no substantive improvement.

I urge the House to allow us to vote on those three amendments. This involves the national security of the United States. We should not be operating under a gag rule. We should not be relying on a traffic cone as a major deterrent on the Canadian border, and that is what we will be doing without the amendment that we want to vote on when we return.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Computer Security Enhancement and Research Act of 2001. This legislation will address the long-term needs in securing our Nation's information infrastructure and will strengthen the security of the non-classified computer systems of Federal agencies. The bill establishes a research and development program on computer and network security at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. It also strengthens the institute's existing responsibilities in developing best computer security practices and standards in assisting Federal